



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/840,226	05/07/2004	Chia-Youn Chang	4658-022	9672
22429	7590	11/06/2008	EXAMINER	
LOWE HAUPTMAN HAM & BERNER, LLP			BUCHANAN, CHRISTOPHER R	
1700 DIAGONAL ROAD			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
SUITE 300			3627	
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314				
		MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE
		11/06/2008		PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/840,226	Applicant(s) CHANG ET AL.
	Examiner CHRISTOPHER R. BUCHANAN	Art Unit 3627

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED. (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(o).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 May 2004.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-13 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-13 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 07 May 2004 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/DP/0656) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Campbell (US 2004/0210525) in view of Maners (US 6,507,826).

Regarding claims 1 and 6, Campbell discloses a system/method for online billing that includes means for/steps of connecting to a web-based interface for signing into a billing system by a user (abstract, par. 27, par. 29), verifying a check sheet to determine the accuracy of the check sheet (par. 29, performs verification by comparing billing data 40 with data listing 142 and displays a screen confirming data), issuing an account statement (par. 30, invoice lists client and provider data), and generating an invoice (par. 30, software generates an invoice). The system also includes printing means (par. 30) that could be used to print various documents, such as a check sheet, and means for forwarding and generating various files.

The invention Campbell differs from the claimed invention in that it does not explicitly show examining the authority of a user or the user to be a supplier.

Maners discloses a system/method for online billing that discloses examining the authority of a user (col. 6 line 32-36, determines if user is authorized). Furthermore, a

variety of entities (suppliers, billing services, vendors, etc.) could use the system/method without affecting the nature or functioning of the invention and the particular entity using the system/method would be a matter of design choice.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system/method of Campbell to include examining the authority of a user, as taught by Maners, and a user that is a supplier, as suggested by design choice, to provide various entities with access to a secure billing system.

Regarding claim 2, electronic mail is a well-known means for communication. Regarding claim 3, the system of Campbell includes means for operating account statements, payment, invoice files, etc. (par. 29-30, includes billing mechanism, means for generating statements and invoices). Regarding claim 4, the system includes means for consolidating data to determine the check sheet's accuracy (par. 29, data from different files is compared and a confirmation screen is displayed). Regarding claim 5, if the data is not accurate and up to date the billing data will not be confirmed. Regarding claim 7, the examining is to assure that the user is authorized to sign in to the system (password required). Regarding claim 8, the particular process to follow after access is denied would be a matter of design choice. Regarding claims 9 and 10, a dispute mark is generated (screen showing data not confirmed, call signal generated, par. 29, Campbell) when the data on the check sheet is not confirmed and a signal is dispatched to notify relevant personnel (at alternative billing center). Regarding claims 11-13, the nature of the data would be a matter of design choice.

Conclusion

4. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure and are cited on PTO Form 892 enclosed herewith.
5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to CHRISTOPHER R. BUCHANAN whose telephone number is (571)272-8134. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Fri. 9:00am - 5:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ryan Zeender can be reached on 571-272-6790. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/C. R. B./
Examiner, Art Unit 3627
/F. Ryan Zeender/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3627